

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 17 is provided, for example, in the specification on page 17, line 23, through page 18, line 17.

Claims 1-12 and 17 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Dapper (US 6,487,405) in view of Schmidt (US 7,142,882). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Dapper (US 6,487,405) in view of Schmidt (US 7,142,882) and Buhrmann et al. (US 5,854,984). Claims 15 and 16 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Dapper (US 6,487,405) in view of Schmidt (US 7,142,882), Buhrmann et al. (US 5,854,984), and Silver et al. (US 5,828,949). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 defines a communication apparatus that reconfigures a portion of a baseband signal processor executing processing that is different among a plurality of radio communication systems, based on programming data of a newly switched radio communication system, but does not reconfigure another portion of the baseband signal processor that is common among the radio communication systems. The claimed subject matter supports increasing the efficiency of the radio communication systems by reducing the programming information that must be downloaded to the communication apparatus for its operation when switching to a different communication system (see specification page 4, lines 3-26). (References herein to the

specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

The Office Action acknowledges that Dapper does not disclose the claimed subject matter of reconfiguring a portion of a baseband signal processor executing processing that is different among a plurality of radio communication systems (see Office Action page 3, second paragraph). To overcome this deficiency, the Office Action proposes that Schmidt teaches this subject matter (see page 3, third paragraph).

However, Schmidt discloses changing the number of active processors depending on the application (see Schmidt col. 3, lines 50-67). Schmidt's reconfiguration processing is not different between radio communication systems.

Moreover, claim 1 now recites halting either a clock or a power supply in an unused portion of a baseband signal processor. Dapper and Schmidt do not teach or suggest this subject matter alone or together.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Dapper and Schmidt, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 1.

Independent claim 17 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 1 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 13-16 are obviated and allowance of claims 1 and 17 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: October 28, 2008
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-05121
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559